DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 392 CG 007 863

AUTHOR	Kidder, Steven J.; Aubertine, Horace E.
TITLE	Attitude Change and Number of Plays of a Social Simulation Game.
INSTITUTION	Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Research and Development Centers Branch.
REPORT NO	JHU-145
BUREAU NO	BR-6-1610
PUB DATE	Dec 72
GRANT	OEG-2-7-061610-0207
NOTE	24p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes; *Changing Attitudes; Ethnic Groups; *Games; High School Students; *Inner City; Racial Discrimination; *Simulation; *Social Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Ghetto Game

ABSTRACT

An experimental study was conducted in order to determine the effect of number of plays of the social simulation game "Ghetto" on attitudes toward people in general and ghetto people. It was expected that attitude change would increase with an increase in the number of plays of the game. This effect was not obtained. The game effect was greatest immediately after a thirty-five minute introduction to the game followed by two rounds of the game. The students' attitudes toward ghetto people seemed unusually positive for all treatment groups whether they played the game or not. Nevertheless, because the largest effect was obtained after the shortest experience with the game, it was suggested that teachers might use the game as a brief introduction to social problems in inner-city environments. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Center for Social Organization of Schools

REPORT NO. 145
DECEMBER, 1972

ATTITUDE CHANGE AND NUMBER OF PLAYS
OF A SOCIAL SIMULATION GAME

STEVEN J. KIDDER, HORACE E. AUBERTINE

ED 077 863

STAFF

John L. Holland, Director

James M. McPartland, Assistant Director

Virginia B. Bailey

Zahava D. Blum

Joan E. Brown

Judith F. Clark

James S. Coleman

Ganie A. DeHart

David L. DeVries

Keith J. Edwards

Gail M. Fennessey

James J. Fennessey

Stephanie G. Freeman

Ellen Greenberger

Rubie J. Harris

Edward J. Harsch

Robert T. Hogan

John H. Holtfield

Kathryn Hollis

Karen L. Jaworski

Nancy L. Karweit

Shirley M. Knox

Margaret W. Lewis

Samuel A. Livingston

Edward McDill

Alyce J. Nafziger

Dean H. Nafziger

John P. Snyder

Julian C. Stanley

B. James Starr

Gerald D. Williams

Evelyn Zulver

ED 072392

ATTITUDE CHANGE AND NUMBER OF PLAYS OF A SOCIAL SIMULATION GAME

GRANT NO. OEG-2-7-061610-0207

PROGRAM NO. R16J1
PROJECT NO. R16J1A

STEVEN J. KIDDER

HORACE E. AUBERTINE

REPORT NO. 145

DECEMBER, 1972

Published by the Center for Social Organization of Schools, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The Center for Social Organization of Schools has two primary objectives: to develop a scientific knowledge of how schools affect their students, and to use this knowledge to develop better school practices and organization.

The Center works through five programs to achieve its objectives. The Academic Games program has developed simulation games for use in the classroom. It is evaluating the effects of games on student learning and studying how games can improve interpersonal relations in the schools. The Social Accounts program is examining how a student's education affects his actual occupational attainment, and how education results in different vocational outcomes for blacks and whites. The Schools and Maturity program is studying the effects of educational experience on a wide range of human talents, competencies, and personal dispositions in order to formulate -- and research -- important educational goals other than traditional academic achievement. The School Organization program is currently concerned with authority-control structures, task structures, reward systems, and peer group processes in schools. The Careers and Curricula program bases its work upon a theory of career development. It has developed a self-administered vocational guidance device and a self-directed career program to promote vocational development and to foster satisfying curricular decisions for high school, college, and adult populations.

This report, prepared by the Academic Games program, examines how the number of plays of a social simulation game affects changes in students' attitudes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the teachers and students at the Metcalf Laboratory School, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois for their cooperation in completing the instructional phases of the present study. We also thank Eugene H. Jabker, Director of Research, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois for his assistance in the initial phases of the study. In addition, Samuel A. Livingston provided helpful comments on the final draft while Linda P. Ferraris typed the entire manuscript.

ABSTRACT

An experimental study was conducted in order to determine the effect of number of plays of the social simulation game Ghetto on attitudes toward people in general and ghetto people. It was expected that attitude change would increase with an increase in the number of plays of the game. This effect was not obtained. The game effect was greatest immediately after a thirty-five minute introduction to the game followed by two rounds of the game. The students' attitudes toward ghetto people seemed unusually positive for all treatment groups whether they played the game or not. Nevertheless, because the largest effect was obtained after the shortest experience with the game, it was suggested that teachers might use the game as a brief introduction to social problems in inner-city environments.

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of time, money, and effort over the last ten years has gone into attitude-change research. Most of this research was done by sociologists and psychologists and focused on role-playing. Some of the role-playing activities used included improvising speeches and delivering prepared speeches before a particular audience. Much of the research boils down to the fact that when a person plays a role, in one form or another, his attitude becomes more like the attitude he expresses during the role-playing experience.

Several individuals have studied the effects of simulation games on attitude change. Livingston & Stoll (in press) summarize several research findings dealing with this topic:

> Boocock (1963) noted that playing an election game produced both "realistic" attitudes about politics and a negative evaluation of politics as a career.
>
> Garvey and Seiler (1966) and Cherryholmes (1963) both found that the Inter-Nation Simulation produced "realistic" attitudes toward politics, though no more effectively than conventional teaching methods.
>
> Boocock (1966) discovered that after playing the Life Career game, boys seemed more sympathetic toward potential school dropouts, while girls seemed less so. She also found that boys and girls who played the Democracy game displayed no differences in political attitudes afterward.

In addition, several recent studies examined the structural effects of simulation games on attitude change.[1] From the results of two studies, Livingston (1972) noted that students' acceptance of tolerance for the log-rolling activities of congressmen increased after playing the Democracy game (Coleman, 1969). Building upon this finding, Livingston and Kidder (1972) provided evidence

---

[1] The reader may note that a systematic attempt is being made in these studies to provide knowledge about simulation games that is both cumulative and generalizable as suggested by Fletcher (1971).

that this change in the students' acceptance of log-rolling depended on both the game structure and the identification of the player's role as that of a congressman.

Edwards (1971), using the simulation game, Trade and Develop (Livingston, 1969), found that "...after playing the basic version of T/D (Trade and Develop) twice, further playing of the basic game or the advanced game will not increase students' understanding of the mechanics of the game (perceptions), strategies of play, or analogies between the game model and the real situation." (p.iv) Although the latter study did not deal specifically with attitude change, the lack of findings for analogies between the game model and the real situation is significant if one believes that the learning process involved in attitude change is directly related to the subjects' ability at developing such analogies.

The present study used as an experimental treatment the social simulation game Ghetto (Toll, 1969). The Ghetto game is effective in changing players' attitudes toward poor people (Livingston, 1970) but not for long time periods (Livingston, 1971). The objective of the present study was to analyze the effect of the number of plays of the Ghetto game on the players' attitudes toward ghetto people in particular. It was expected that, following a standardized introduction to the game, students playing the game for one, two, and three fifty-minute class periods would experience an increase in attitude change. In other words, attitude change would be greater after three class periods with the game than after two class periods which would be greater than after one class period with the game.

METHOD

Subjects, Experimental Design, Procedure

Sixty-three high school seniors, mostly middle-class whites, participated in this study.[1] They were assigned randomly to four treatment groups: three experimental groups and one control group. The three experimental groups played the Ghetto game for one, two, and three class periods, respectively. About half of the first period was taken up by a standardized introduction, in which the students were shown how to play the game. Following the introduction, the classes completed about two rounds of the game. In addition, about eight rounds were completed each period thereafter. Thus, Treatment Group 1 received the introduction plus two rounds, Treatment Group 2 received the introduction and ten rounds, while Treatment Group 3 received the introduction plus eighteen rounds of the game. Each group answered the post-game questionnaire immediately after playing the game for their assigned number of periods. The control group answered the questionnaire without having played the game.

Dependent Variables

Attitudes towards two types of people were of interest in the present study. One instrument was used to collect attitudes toward "people in general" and "ghetto people." (See Appendix A for the complete instrument.) The definition of attitude reflected in the instrument is based on the work of Anderson and Fishbein (1965), as reported in Fishbein (1967).

---

[1] This study was conducted at the Metcalf Laboratory School, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois.

These authors suggest that one can define an attitude toward an object "...to be a part function of the total amount of affect associated with each of the beliefs about the object." (in Fishbein, 1967, p. 437).

The questionnaire was divided into two parts; Part 1 referred to people in general, and Part 2 referred to ghetto people in particular. Each part contained five groups of items, constructed to detect the subject's beliefs about people and the amount of positive or negative affect associated with each belief. The items were presented in a modified semantic-differential format. For example, the first group of items looks like this:

People are honest.

true:	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	false
never:	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	always
possible:	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	impossible

Being honest is.

good:	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	bad
foolish:	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	wise
harmful:	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	beneficial
wrong:	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	right
important:	___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___	unimportant

The subject's responses to the first three items in each group indicate his degree of belief in a statement attributing some quality (in this case, honesty) to ghetto people (or to people in general); his responses to the next five items indicate his positive or negative feelings toward the quality. The seven options (the spaces that the subject could check) were assigned scores from 1 through 7, with the seven-point options being the "true" extreme for each belief item and the "goodness" extreme for each affect item. The scores

for the three belief items were then summed to yield a belief score for that quality, and the five affect items were summed to yield an affect score for the quality. The five qualities included in the statements were "honest," "hard-working," "responsible," "moral," and "law-abiding."

RESULTS

Table 1 contains the means for the belief and evaluative (affective) components of the subjects' attitudes toward people in general for the control and treatment groups.

Table 2 contains the multivariate and univariate analyses of the main treatment effect of number of plays. The overall multivariate test nearly reached significance at the .05 level ($F=1.53$, $p < .055$). On univariate tests the following dependent variables were significant: (1) Hardworking-affect ($F=2.90$, $df=3/55$, $p < .04$); (2) Responsible-belief ($F=3.59$, $df=3/55$, $p < .02$); (3) Moral-belief ($F=3.31$, $df = 3/55$, $p < .03$). Two other variables were nearly significant on these univariate tests: Honest-affect and Moral-affect. The three variables accounting for the largest proportion of the total variance were (1) Responsible-belief, (2) Moral-belief, (3) Hardworking-affect. If the mean values of the latter variables are compared to the values for the control group, one realizes that the students' feelings about human behavior immediately after their first encounter with the game have become quite pessimistic.

It should be noted that the original design included a sex factor. However, no sex effect was obtained in the analysis; nor were any interactions significant. Thus, only the simple effects for number of plays of the game are reported below.

Table 3 contains the analysis of variance for the simple effect of two rounds of the Ghetto game versus the control group on the subjects' attitudes toward people in general. The overall multivariate test was significant ($F=2.59$, $p < .01$), and seven out of ten univariate tests of the dependent variables were significant; (1) Honest-affect ($F=5.44$, $p < .02$); (2) Hard-working-affect ($F=6.47$, $p < .01$); (3) Responsible-belief ($F=8.25$, $p < .01$);

(4)Responsible-affect ($F=4.32$, $p < .04$); (5) Moral-belief ($F=7.65$, $p < .01$); (6) Moral-affect ($F=6.50$, $p < .01$); (7) Law-abiding belief ($F=4.74$, $p < .03$). The game did influence the subjects' attitudes on substantive variables from morality and law-abidingness to being responsible. In addition, both the belief and affective component of the students' attitudes toward responsibility and morality were modified. The variables accounting for the largest proportion of total variance were the belief components of the responsibility and morality variables. However, the reader should refer to Table 1 with the treatment means for an analysis of the direction of attitude change for two rounds of Ghetto versus the control group. For all significant effects, the means for the first game group are lower than the means for the control group. The control group values represent the experimental population's "base-line" attitudes toward people in general at the time of the study. If reference is made to the instrument in Appendix A, the reader will note that the lower average responses of the game group relative to the control group imply a general pessimism with regard to people's behavior. The game participants were not as willing to believe that people are responsible and moral after the game experience. Did this generalized pessimism remain after ten and eighteen more rounds of the Ghetto game? No, it did not. The tests for the simple effects for the "ten rounds" and "eighteen rounds" groups were not significant for any dependent variables. Again, Table 1 provides the answer to this unexpected result. The subjects playing the game more often begin to "normalize" (approach the control group's means) their attitudes toward people in general.

Table 4 contains the subjects' average ratings on the attitude measures for ghetto people by treatment groups. Similar patterns exist for ghetto people and people in general. However, there is an obvious difference in the magnitude of the means; nearly all of the mean ratings for ghetto people

are higher (i.e., more believable and more positive, affectively) than for people in general. Thus, for the sample in the present study (mid-western seniors in high school) ghetto people are more honest, hardworking, responsible, moral, and law-abiding than people in general. Social desirability in responding must have occurred. Nevertheless, did the experience these subjects had affect their attitudes towards ghetto people? All multivariate and univariate tests of main treatment effects for these attitudes toward ghetto people proved non-significant. There was a tendency, after the first two rounds of the game, for the subjects to lower their high positive reactions to the ghetto related items. From ten to eighteen rounds, their reactions remained high relative to people in general and began approaching the control group mean.

DISCUSSION

It was originally hypothesized that the subjects' attitudes toward people in general and ghetto people would be modified most effectively with approximately three class periods of the game Ghetto plus an introduction. This effect was not obtained. The greatest attitude change occurred immediately after the introduction plus two rounds of Ghetto. This effect was greatest for students' attitudes toward people in general. Their attitudes toward ghetto people were "abnormally" high. The test instrument and experimental conditions must have induced the students to respond with what they considered to be socially acceptable answers to the items for ghetto people as effectively as their attitudes toward people in general.

As noted in the introduction, studies by Boocock (1963), Garvey and Seiler (1966) and Cherryholmes (1963) found that game participants' attitudes were more "realistic" following the game experience. In the present study, the students rated attitudes toward people in general less positively (affectively) and believed less in the concepts after their first experience with the game. Whether this change resulted in more realistic attitudes is questionable because the treatment group is being compared to a control group that provides "normal" attitudes. The game seemed to induce pessimism with regard to human conduct which may have lead to less positive attitudes toward people in general. In addition, the effect was greatest after one class period of the game, then decreased with subsequent plays of the game. Perhaps the emotional impact of the simulation decreased during increased exposure.

The lack of substantial changes in the subjects' attitudes toward ghetto people was unexpected. Attitude change theory suggests that one's attitude may become more like the attitude one has to express during role-playing exercises. The types of roles one may play in the Ghetto game are such that a player experi-

iences the self-defeating nature of the ghetto. A person may "give up" and start hustling people or become depressed over the number of children he is having and/or the constraints keeping him on welfare. This effect might also cause players to sympathize with ghetto people. If this occurred during the game, their attitudes toward ghetto people, which were highly sympathetic, could reasonably have remained unchanged.

If attitude change in a simulation game depends upon the player's ability to make an analogy between his role and its real-life counterpart (ghetto people in the present study), would this help to explain the present findings? We could assume that the players never really adopted their roles because they had nothing in their past experience that related to the game situation. Perhaps to them ghetto people meant migrant workers. Perhaps their inability to make analogies between the game and real-life lessened the overall effect of the game on their attitudes toward ghetto people.

The findings in the present study suggest that the initial experience with a social simulation game may have the greatest effect on the participants' attitudes toward the phenomenon being simulated. If this finding can be verified by further research, the implication for classroom uses of social simulation games in modifying students' attitudes seems clear; simulation games could be used at the beginning of curriculum units to create more realistic attitudes toward the material being covered in the unit.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Lynn R. and Fishbein, Martin, "Prediction of Attitude from the Number Strength, and Evaluative Aspect of Beliefs about the Attitude Object: A Comparison of Summation and Congruity Theories." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 3, 1965, pp. 437-443, as reprinted in Fishbein (1967).

Boocock, Sarane S., "Effects of an Election Campaign Game in Four High School Classes." Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, mimeographed, 1963.

Boocock, Sarane S., "An Experimental Study of the Learning Effects of Two Games with Simulated Environments." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1966, pp. 8-17.

Cherryholmes, Cleo H., "Developments in Simulation of International Relations for High School Teaching." Emporia: Kansas State Teachers College, Unpublished master's thesis, 1963.

Coleman, James S., Democracy, New York: Western Publishing Company, 1969.

Edwards, Keith J., "The Effect of Ability, Achievement, and Number of Plays on Learning From a Simulation Game." Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University. Report No. 115, September, 1971.

Fishbein, Martin, Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1967.

Fletcher, Jerry L., "The Effectiveness of Simulation Games as Learning Environments: A Proposed Program of Research." Simulation & Games, Vol. II, No. 4, December, 1971, pp. 425-454.

Garvey, Dale M. and Seiler, William, "A Study of the Effectiveness of Different Methods of Teaching International Relations to High School Students." Emporia: Kansas State Teachers College, 1966.

Livingston, S.A., Trade and Develop. Baltimore: Academic Games Associates, 1969.

Livingston, S.A., "Simulation Games and Attitude Change: Attidues Toward the Poor." Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University. Report No. 63, 1970.

Livingston, S.A., "Simulation Games and Attitudes Toward the Poor." Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Report No. 118, October 1971.

Livingston, S. A., "Effects of a Legislative Simulation Game on the Political Attitudes of Junior High School Students." Simulation and Games, Vol. III, No. 1, March, 1972, pp. 41-51.

Livingston, S.A., and Kidder, Steven J., "Role Identification and Game Structure: Effects on Political Attitudes." Baltimore: Center For Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University. Report No. 134, 1972.

Livingston, Samuel A. and Stoll, Clarice S., Simulation Games: An Introduction for the Social Studies Teacher, New York: Free Press, In Press.

Toll, Dove, Ghetto. New York: Western Publishing Company, 1969.

TABLE 1

MEAN RATINGS ON ATTITUDES TOWARDS
PEOPLE-IN-GENERAL BY TREATMENT GROUPS

Dependent Variables	Control Group (N=15)	2 Rounds Of Ghetto (N=16)	10 Rounds Of Ghetto (N=17)	18 Rounds of Ghetto (N=15)
Honest:				
belief	7.5	7.3	7.8	7.6
affect	11.0	6.7	8.8	9.3
Hardworking:				
belief	6.7	7.4	6.8	7.1
affect	9.8	5.6	8.4	7.6
Responsible:				
belief	7.8	5.3	6.8	6.7
affect	9.4	5.8	8.0	8.3
Moral:				
belief	8.5	6.0	7.6	7.3
affect	9.6	6.9	11.4	9.9
Law-abiding:				
belief	8.3	6.2	8.5	7.0
affect	9.7	6.4	8.0	8.9

NOTE: EACH TREATMENT GROUP RECEIVED A THIRTY-FIVE MINUTE INTRODUCTION TO THE GHETTO GAME ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE STUDY.

TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MAIN EFFECT OF NUMBER OF PLAYS OF GHETTO

Dependent Variables	Mean Square	Univariate F	P Less Than	η^2
Honest:				
belief	0.92	0.17	.92	.01
affect	48.93	2.56	.06	.12
Hardworking:				
belief	1.57	0.30	.82	.02
affect	48.63	2.90	.04	.13
Responsible:				
belief	16.32	3.59	.02	.16
affect	36.83	1.70	.18	.08
Moral:				
belief	16.48	3.31	.03	.15
affect	56.44	2.66	.06	.12
Law-abiding:				
belief	19.38	2.46	.07	.12
affect	30.23	1.50	.23	.08

Multivariate F-ratio = 1.53, $p < .055$.

NOTE: ALL UNIVARIATE TESTS WERE BASED UPON MULTIPLE F-RATIOS WITH 3 AND 55 DEGREES OF FREEDOM.

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TWO ROUNDS OF GHETTO GAME VERSUS CONTROL.

Dependent Variables	Mean Square	Univariate F	P Less Than	η^2
Honest:				
belief	2.00	0.36	.55	.01
affect	103.93	5.44	.02	.09
Hardworking:				
belief	3.81	0.74	.39	.01
affect	108.29	6.47	.01	.10
Responsible:				
belief	37.51	8.25	.01	.12
affect	93.80	4.32	.04	.07
Moral				
belief	38.13	7.65	.01	.12
affect	138.22	6.50	.01	.10
Law-abiding:				
belief	37.39	4.74	.03	.07
affect	68.31	3.38	.07	.06

Multivariate F-ratio = 2.59, $p < .01$.

NOTE: ALL UNIVARIATE TESTS WERE BASED UPON MULTIPLE F-RATIOS WITH 1 AND 55 DEGREES OF FREEDOM.

TABLE 4

MEANS ON ATTITUDES TOWARDS GHETTO PEOPLE BY TREATMENT GROUPS

Dependent Variables	Control Group (N=15)	2 Rounds of Ghetto (N=16)	10 Rounds of Ghetto (N=17)	18 Rounds of Ghetto (N=15)
Honest:				
belief	9.33	9.12	9.18	9.87
affect	16.00	15.25	14.06	18.00
Hardworking:				
belief	7.80	8.06	7.53	7.33
affect	11.33	10.06	9.18	11.20
Responsible:				
belief	8.73	7.69	8.12	8.13
affect	12.13	10.62	10.53	12.27
Moral:				
belief	9.20	8.88	8.35	8.33
affect	14.20	11.37	13.65	12.53
Law-abiding:				
belief	9.20	8.69	9.59	10.00
affect	14.13	14.50	13.06	13.13

APPENDIX A

Instructions for Questionnaire I

We would like to know your feelings about certain ideas or concepts. We would like you to rate several ideas on scales (the broken lines between two words shown below) as follows:

People are honest.

true ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ false

If you feel that the concept being rated (People are honest.) is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place a checkmark as follows:

true ✓ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ false

or

true ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ✓ false

If the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your checkmark as follows:

true ____ : ✓ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ false

or

true ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ✓ : ____ false

If the concept seems only slightly related to one or the other end of the scale (but not closely), you should place your checkmark as follows:

true ____ : ____ : ✓ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ false

or

true ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ✓ : ____ : ____ false

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, then you should place your checkmark as follows:

true ____ : ____ : ____ : ✓ : ____ : ____ : ____ false

You will be rating two types of statements; a complete sentence like "People are honest." followed by a statement of the form "Being honest is:" . You are to rate the concept on the scales below that concept.

Work at a fairly high speed. Do not worry or puzzle over individual statements. We want your first reactions to the concepts.

Begin rating the concepts. If you are unsure of the procedure, ask the monitor or teacher. Work through the entire booklet, without looking back. When you have finished, place the questionnaire in the box at the front of the room.

People are honest.

true	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	false
never	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	always
possible	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	impossible

Being honest is:

good	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	bad
foolish	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	wise
harmful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	beneficial
wrong	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	right
important	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	unimportant

People are hardworking.

true	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	false
never	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	always
possible	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	impossible

Being a hard worker is:

good	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	bad
foolish	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	wise
harmful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	beneficial
wrong	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	right
important	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	unimportant

People are responsible.

true	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	false
never	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	always
possible	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	impossible

Being responsible is:

good	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	bad
foolish	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	wise
harmful	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	beneficial
wrong	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	right
important	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	unimportant

People are moral.

true	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	false
never	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	always
possible	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	impossible

Being moral is:

good	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	bad
foolish	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	wise
harmful	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	beneficial
wrong	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	right
important	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	unimportant

People are law-abiding.

true	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	false
never	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	always
possible	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	impossible

Being law-abiding is:

good	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	bad
foolish	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	wise
harmful	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	beneficial
wrong	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	right
important	_____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	: _____	unimportant

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

Ghetto people are honest.

true	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	false
never	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	always
possible	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	impossible

In your opinion, for ghetto people, being honest is:

good	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	bad
foolish	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	wise
harmful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	beneficial
wrong	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	right
important	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	unimportant

Ghetto people are hardworking.

true	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	false
never	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	always
possible	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	impossible

In your opinion, for ghetto people, being a hardworker is:

good	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	bad
foolish	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	wise
harmful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	beneficial
wrong	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	right
important	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	unimportant

Ghetto people are responsible.

true	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	false
never	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	always
possible	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	impossible

In your opinion, for ghetto people, being responsible is:

good	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	bad
foolish	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	wise
harmful	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	beneficial
wrong	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	right
important	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	unimportant

Ghetto people are moral.

true	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	false
never	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	always
possible	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	impossible

In your opinion, for ghetto people, being moral is:

good	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	bad
foolish	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	wise
harmful	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	beneficial
wrong	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	right
important	____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	unimportant

Ghetto people are law-abiding.

true	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	false
never	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	always
possible	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	impossible

In your opinion, for ghetto people, being law-abiding is:

good	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	bad
foolish	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	wise
harmful	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	beneficial
wrong	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	right
important	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	unimportant

STOP!

END OF QUESTIONNAIRE